



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SPC

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/547,627 04/12/00 DUNCAN

D 066416.0103

EXAMINER

TM02/1106

ROBERT W HOLLAND
BAKER BOTTS LLP
2001 ROSS AVENUE
DALLAS TX 75201-2980

BUI, B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2642

DATE MAILED:

11/06/01

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

HG

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/547,627

Applicant(s)
Duncan et al

Examiner
Bing Bui

Art Unit
2642



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 16, 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2642

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. The indicated allowability of claims 48-50 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered references to Jolissaint (US Pat No. 5,040,208) and Gisby (US Pat No. 6,002,760). Rejections based on the newly cited references follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

2. Claims 1, 3-35, 37-44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Walker et al (US Pat No. 6,088,444).

Regarding claim 1, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, a method for ordering inbound inquiries comprising:

receiving plural inbound inquiries, each inbound inquiry having associated inquiry information (Figs 5-8 and col 5, ln 24-col 6, ln 28);

applying a model to the inquiry information to determine a priority value for each inquiry (Figs 5-8 and col 5, ln 24-col 6, ln 28); and

ordering the inbound inquiries with the priority values (Figs 5-8 and col 5, ln 24-col 6, ln 28).

Regarding claim 3, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, wherein the method inquiries comprise instant messages (col 2, ln 49-54).

Art Unit: 2642

Regarding claim 4, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, wherein the inbound inquiries comprise inbound telephone calls having associated caller information (col 5, ln 24-31).

Regarding claim 5, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, wherein the caller information comprises automatic number identification information (col 5, ln 24-31).

Regarding claim 6, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, 25 6. wherein caller information comprise destination number identification information (col 5, ln 24-31).

Regarding claim 7, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, the method further comprising the step of gathering the caller information with a voice response unit (col 5, ln 41-54).

Regarding claim 8, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, the method further comprising:

associating demographic information with each inbound telephone call based on the caller information of the inbound call (Figs 5-8 and col 5, ln 24-col 6, ln 28); and

applying the model to the caller information to determine the priority value for each telephone call (Figs 5-8 and col 5, ln 24-col 6, ln 28).

Regarding claim 9, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, wherein the model predicts caller behavior (col 3, ln 46-col 4, ln 8).

Art Unit: 2642

Regarding claim 10, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, wherein the priority

value comprises a probability that the telephone call will result in a purchase (col 3, In 46-col 4, In 8).

Regarding claim 11, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, wherein the priority value comprises a probability that the caller associated with the telephone call will terminate the call after a hold time (col 3, In 46-col 4, In 8).

Regarding claim 12, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, the method further comprising the step of developing plural models from a history of inbound inquiries to forecast plural outcomes that determine the priority value (col 3, In 64-col 4, In 8 and col 6, In 29-42).

Regarding claim 13, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, wherein developing the model further comprises: applying regression analysis to the history to calculate the priority value (col 3, In 64-col 4, In 8 and col 6, In 29-42).

Regarding claim 14, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, the method further comprising the step of:

determining the outcomes of the plural inbound inquiries (col 3, In 64-col 4, In 8 and col 6, In 29-42); and

updating the history with the outcomes of the plural inbound inquiries (col 3, In 64-col 4, In 8 and col 6, In 29-42).

Art Unit: 2642

Regarding claim 15, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, wherein developing the caller model further comprises: updating the model with the updated history (col 3, ln 64-col 4, ln 8 and col 6, ln 29-42).

Regarding claim 16, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, a method for determining inbound telephone call priority, the method comprising:

developing one or more models from a history of inbound calls, the history having caller information and outcome results from inbound telephone calls (col 3, ln 46-col 4, ln 8);

applying the model to caller information of a pending inbound call to predict an outcome of the pending inbound call (col 3, ln 46-col 4, ln 8); and

associating a priority with the pending inbound call, the priority based on the predicted outcome (col 3, ln 46-col 4, ln 8).

As to claims 17-19, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claims 4-6, respectively.

Regarding claim 20, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, wherein the caller information further comprises account information, the method further comprising the step of obtaining account information for the pending inbound call, the account information stored in a database by association with the telephony information (col 3, ln 15-38).

As to claim 21, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claim 7.

Art Unit: 2642

As to claim 22, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claim 20.

As to claims 23-25, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claims 9-11, respectively.

Regarding claim 26, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, the method further comprising the step of placing the pending inbound call in the queue of an automatic call distribution system in an order based on the priority of the pending inbound call (col 3, ln 15-25).

As to claim 27, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claim 16.

Regarding claim 28, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, wherein the predicted outcome comprises the hold time of the pending inbound call (col 6, ln 29-42).

Regarding claim 29, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, wherein associating priority further comprises optimizing the order for the inbound telephone calls (col 6, ln 43-54).

Regarding claim 30, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, wherein optimizing the order comprises solving a constrained optimization problem using one or estimates from one or more models (col 6, ln 43-54).

Regarding claim 31, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, wherein optimizing further comprises maximizing agent productivity to minimize caller attrition (col 6, ln 43-54).

Art Unit: 2642

Regarding claim 32, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, wherein optimizing further comprises maximizing agent productivity to produce sales (col 6, ln 43-54).

Regarding claim 33, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, system for scheduling inbound calls comprising:

a receiving device operable to receive plural inbound inquiries and to provide the inbound inquiries to one or more agents (Figs 1-2 and col 3, ln 15-25);

a scheduling module interfaced with the receiving device, the scheduling model operable to order the inbound inquiries for handling by the receiving device, the order based in part on the predicted outcome of the inbound inquiries (col 3, ln 46-col 4, ln 8).

As to claims 34-35, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claim 26 above, since claims 34-35 are merely a system for implementing the method defined in the method claim 26.

As to claim 37, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claim 7 above, since claim 37 is merely a system for implementing the method defined in the method claim 7.

Regarding claim 38, Walker et al teach the invention as claimed, the system further comprising:

Art Unit: 2642

an inbound call history data base operable to store outcome results and caller information from plural completed inbound calls (col 3, ln 64-col 4, ln 8 and col 6, ln 29-42); and

a modeling module interfaced with the history database and operable to model inbound call outcomes from the stored outcome results and caller information (col 3, ln 64-col 4, ln 8 and col 6, ln 29-42).

As to claim 39, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claim 33.

As to claim 40, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claim 26 above, since claim 40 is merely a system for implementing the method defined in the method claim 26.

As to claim 41, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claim 12 above, since claim 41 is merely a system for implementing the method defined in the method claim 12.

As to claim 42, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claim 29 above, since claim 42 is merely a system for implementing the method defined in the method claim 29.

As to claim 43, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claim 31 above, since claim 43 is merely a system for implementing the method defined in the method claim 31.

As to claim 44, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claim 1.

Art Unit: 2642

As to claim 46, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claim 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

3. Claims 2, 36, 45 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al as applied to claims 1, 33 and 44 above, and further in view of Rogers et al (US Pat No. 5,946,386).

Regarding claims 2, 36, 45 and 47, Walker et al teach the invention substantially as claimed, with exception of providing the plural media comprise telephone calls and e-mail messages and voice of internet. However, Rogers et al disclose a system in which communication users can communicate to each other in form of voice and data via Internet (Fig 1; col 11, ln 45-50 and col 28, ln 42-54).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the use of internet as taught by Rogers et al into communication system of Walker et al to enable the communication users to exchange the e-mail or voice which provides more communication flexibility and communication cost saving to such communication users.

4. Claims 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al in view of Gisby (US Pat No. 6,002,760), of record.

Art Unit: 2642

Regarding claims 48-49, Walker et al teach the invention substantially as claimed, a method for ordering inbound inquiries comprising:

receiving plural inbound inquiries, from plural inquiry media, each inbound inquiry having associated inquiry information (Figs 5-8 and col 5, ln 24-col 6, ln 28);

applying the inquiry information to one or more models to determine a priority value for each inquiry (Figs 5-8 and col 5, ln 24-col 6, ln 28); and

ordering the inbound inquiries with the priority values (Figs 5-8 and col 5, ln 24-col 6, ln 28).

Walker et al differs from claimed invention in that it does not explicitly teach the method of scheduling one or more inbound inquiries for an outbound contact attempt at a time based on the priority of the inbound inquiry and informing the inquirer time scheduled for call back. However, Gisby teaches a method in which one or more callers waiting in the queue can leave or disconnect from the queue and to be scheduled for call back for processing without losing priority order in the queue, wherein time scheduled for call back is informed to each caller (col 6, ln 57-col 7, ln 5).

Therefore, having the cited art, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the method of scheduling and informing time for calling back to the callers who left the queue without losing priority order in the queue to provide both caller and organization processing the call more convenience in managing time and resources.

Art Unit: 2642

5. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al in view of Jolissaint (US Pat No. 5,040,208).

Regarding claim 50, Walker et al teach the invention substantially as claimed, a method for ordering inbound inquiries comprising:

receiving plural inbound inquiries, from plural inquiry media, each inbound inquiry having associated inquiry information (Figs 5-8 and col 5, ln 24-col 6, ln 28);

applying the inquiry information to one or more models to determine a priority value for each inquiry (Figs 5-8 and col 5, ln 24-col 6, ln 28); and

ordering the inbound inquiries with the priority values (Figs 5-8 and col 5, ln 24-col 6, ln 28).

Walker et al differs from claimed invention in that it does not explicitly teach the method of asking the inbound inquirer for the channel and time for a response and scheduling a response at the channel and time. However, Jolissaint teaches a method in which one or more callers waiting in the queue can leave or disconnect from the queue to be asked for providing telephone number (channel) and time made available for called back (col 3, ln 40-62).

Therefore, having the cited art, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the method of asking the caller for providing telephone number (channel) and time made available for called back to provide caller more convenient in managing his time.

Art Unit: 2642

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 8/16/01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to Applicant's Remarks, Applicant mainly argues the following subject matters:

(1) Walker does not disclose the model as claimed since Walker performs no mathematical analysis on the call information and does not forecast any outcome.

As a result, Applicant states that Walker can not anticipate Applicant claimed invention because Walker does not disclose, suggest or teach all of the limitations recited by claims 1, 16, 33, 39 and 44. The evidences provided by Applicant are:

(2) As to claim 1, Walker fails to teach applying a model to the inquiry information to determine a priority value for each inquiry.

(3) As to claim 16, Walker fails to teach applying the model to caller information of a pending inbound call to predict an outcome of the pending inbound call.

(4) As to claim 33, Walker fails to teach the scheduling model operable to order the inbound inquiries for handling by the receiving device, the order based in part on the predicted outcome of the inbound inquiries.

(5) As to claim 39, Walker fails to teach a scheduling system associated with the receiving device and having a scheduling module that prioritizes the inbound calls in accordance with forecasted outcomes for the inbound calls.

Art Unit: 2642

(6) As to claim 44, Walker fails to teach applying the inquiry information to one or more models to determine a priority value for each inquiry.

As to parts (1), (2), (3) and (6), Examiner respectfully disagrees since Walker discloses a system and method in which customer inquiry information related to a call such as total number of items to be ordered, the total dollar amount of the order, profitability and customer status are calculated for assigning an economic value for determining a position rank for such call in a queue (priority level) or in another word, economic value related to the call is mathematical analyzed and based on the result of this analysis, the position of such call in the queue is determined; this means a call having higher economic value occupies higher position than to those having lower economic value in the queue and to those of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that the profitability or outcome obtained by organization receiving the call is transparently predictable based on economic value of the call; this means the call with high economic value most likely gives better outcome than those having low economic value.

As to parts (4) and (5), Examiner respectfully disagrees since Walker discloses a system and method in which an ACD assigns or prioritizes a received call to a first position (highest priority) for example, if the assigned economic value of such call is higher than any calls currently in the queue or in another word, the received call is scheduled to be processed before any other calls currently in the queue by the ACD.

Art Unit: 2642

For above reasons, Walker 's reference is sustained for Examiner's Action which is provided herein.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Srinivasan (US Pat No.5,185,782) discloses a system and method for scheduling call back based on time specified by a caller.

Williams et al (US Pat No.5,627,884) disclose a system and method for outbound calling to a caller who left the hold queue.

Jain et al (US Pat No. 5,742,674) disclose a system and method for informing a caller that an automatic call back will be performed at the requested time.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bing Bui whose telephone number is (703) 308-5858. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314 and for formal communications intended for entry (please label the response

Art Unit: 2642

"EXPEDITED PROCEDURE") or for informal or draft communications not intended for entry (please label the response "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Bing Bui

Patent Examiner

Oct 29, 2001

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ahmad Matar", is written over the typed name and title.

AHMAD MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600